

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-18, 20, 23-28, 30, and 33-38 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-47 were presented for examination. Claims 4, 6, 7, 19, 21, 22, 29, 31, 32, 39-47 have been cancelled by amendment.

In the office action mailed December 27, 2005 (the "Office Action"), the Examiner objected to the information disclosure statement submitted on April 15, 2005 (the "IDS") as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2), and further objected to the abstract as including extraneous markings. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 16-22, 26, 29-32, and 36 were objected to based on informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-13, and 15 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,093 to Bogin *et al.* (the "Bogin patent"). Claims 24, 26-29, 34, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0166006 to Talbot *et al.* (the "Talbot reference") in further view of the Bogin patent. Claims 16-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bogin patent in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,904,556 to Walton (the "Walton patent"). Claims 25 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Talbot reference and the Bogin patent, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,672 to Jiang *et al.* (the "Jiang patent"). Claims 8, 14, 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bogin patent in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128449 to Osborne *et al.* (the "Osborne patent"). Claims 33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Talbot reference and the Bogin patent, and in further view of the Osborne patent. Claims 5-7, 20, 22, and 30-32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Claims 39-47 have been cancelled in light of the restriction requirement and the election of claims 1-38 for examination.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the IDS, a new IDS in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2) has been included for consideration.

The abstract has been amended to remove the extraneous markings. Attached is a clean copy of the abstract.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 26, 28, and 36 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections. Claim 11 has not been amended as suggested by the Examiner because the "bypass

path” recited at line 3 is the “bypass path” introduced at line 2. Thus, reference to “the . . . bypass path” at line 3 is proper. The objection to claims 1-8, 10-13, 16-22, 26, 29-32, and 36 should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 22, and consequently, claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 24, and 34 have been amended to recite that the arbitration logic is operable “to develop the control signal to alternately output a number of memory responses stored in the buffered queue and the same number of memory responses stored in the local queue if the number or a greater number of responses are stored in each queue.” The limitation added to claims 1 and 24 is similar to the limitations specifically recited in claims 6 and 7, and 31 and 32, respectively. Although claim 7 *as filed* depended from claims 1, 4, 5, and 6, claim 7 should have depended only on claims 1 and 6, which would have been similar to the dependency of allowable claim 22 from claims 15 and 21. Similarly, claim 32 *as filed* depended from 24, 29, 30, and 31, although the dependency should have been only from claims 24 and 31. Claim 34 has been amended to include limitations similar to allowable claim 22. Based on the allowability of claim 22, the limitations added to claims 1, 24, and 34 should be sufficient to place these claims in condition for allowance.


Claim 9 has been amended to recite limitations similar to allowable claim 20, and consequently, is in condition for allowance.

The amendments made to claims 1, 9, 15, 24, and 34, have been made to expedite the allowance of allowable subject matter. The amendments, however, should not be interpreted as reflecting Applicants’ belief that the subject matter of the unamended claims is unpatentable, or that the Applicants have forfeited the subject matter of the unamended claims. Moreover, Applicants have not addressed the merits of the Examiner’s rejection of the claims, or whether the Examiner’s characterizations of the cited references are accurate. Therefore, the presumption that Applicants have tacitly acknowledged the merit of the rejections or that the references cited by the Examiner are relevant to the patentability of the present invention should not be made.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.
Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



Kimton N. Eng
Registration No. 43,605
Telephone No. (206) 903-8718

KNE:ajs

Enclosures:

- Postcard
- Check
- Fee Transmittal Sheet (+ copy)
- Clean Copy of Abstract
- Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (+ copy)
- Form PTO-1449
- Cited References (2)
- Copy of Related Application

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101-4010
(206) 903-8800 (telephone)
(206) 903-8820 (fax)

h:\ip\clients\micron technology\1200\501293.01\501293.01 amendment.doc